

THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY.

VOL. VIII.

MAY, 1928.

No. 5.

Of Faith.

Translated from Dr. E. Preuss's *Die Lehre von der Rechtfertigung*, Part III.

THE REV. JUL. A. FRIEDRICH, Iowa City, Iowa.

The righteousness of Christ, then, has been procured; but, as the apostle says, it comes "unto all and upon all them that believe." Rom. 3, 22. He who keeps this in mind will be spared the vexations which the Wurttemberg superintendent Burk experienced. It seemed to him like a faulty circle: "I am to believe and thereby become righteous. But what am I to believe? This, that I am righteous. However, I cannot believe this before it is so. And yet it is not so, for I am first to become righteous." God be praised, the case is different. *This* we must believe, that Christ *has* redeemed us. And as God said to His covenant people through Isaiah: "I *have* redeemed thee, I *have* called thee by thy name; thou *art* Mine," Is. 43, 1, even so does He tell us through His apostle: "The handwriting that was against us is blotted out," Col. 2, 14; "He *purged* our sins," Heb. 1, 3; "We *are* reconciled," Rom. 5, 10. Eternal peace reigns; all strife is ended. Col. 1, 20. That saving faith apprehends *this* and nothing else St. Paul teaches in those texts in which he expressly and officially treats of justification. Rom. 4, 24, 25 he says that we are justified "if we believe on Him that raised up Jesus, our Lord, from the dead, who was delivered for our offenses and was raised again for our justification." And 1 Cor. 15, 1—4 he declares that one is saved by believing "that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures, and that He was buried, and that He rose again the third day according to the Scriptures." And lastly, Gal. 2, 20, he describes his own faith as "the faith of the Son of God, who loved me and gave Himself for me." This is also the doctrine of the Augsburg Confession (Art. XII) and of the theologians.

"To believe" — what does that mean? Does it mean to take the death and resurrection of Christ for granted as one takes the battle of Pydna for granted? Most certainly not! Although it would be quite agreeable if Messrs. Strauss and Renan were ready

to do even this. "To believe" means "to take"; "to believe in Christ's merit" means "to take Christ's merit" as the lungs take the air. Although the air surrounds you on all sides, yet it will do you no good if your lungs do not inhale it. Just so the all-sufficient merit of Christ will not help you if you do not apprehend it. St. Paul writes, Col. 2, 6: "As ye *have* therefore *received* Christ Jesus, the Lord, so walk ye in Him." Yes, St. John uses the expressions, "to receive Christ" and "to believe" as equivalents. He says in the first chapter of his Gospel: "As many as received Him, to them gave He power to become the sons of God, even to them that believed on His name." John 1, 12. And Christ Himself says, John 17, 8: "I have given unto them the words which Thou gavest Me; and they *have received* them . . . and *have believed* that Thou didst send Me." *Vice versa*, Scripture describes unbelief as the act of not receiving Christ. "He came unto His own, and His own received Him not." John 1, 11. Therefore we say with Chemnitz: Saving faith is nothing else than the apprehension of Christ (*Est igitur apprehensio, acceptio seu applicatio promissionis gratiae formale fidei justificantis*); he who will not receive is not justified (*Qui non accipiunt, non justificantur*). And with Oeder: Faith is nothing less and nothing more than the instrument with which we appropriate a foreign righteousness. In truth, as long as we are on this earth, no one sits in the ship, but we are all lying in the water. Therefore we must constantly cling to the rim of the boat in which Christ is sitting. The prayer, "Suffer us not to sink in the bitter pains of death," and the other, "Suffer us not to fall from the comfort of true faith," are one and the same. By what other organ than by faith could we possibly become partakers of the merits of Christ? Mental remedies are received in no other way. A father believes his son to be dead. When you tell him, "He lives!" he hears the message, but lacks faith. What will it profit him? Or a guilty conscience has driven a child away from home. The mother publishes advertisements, "Return! You are forgiven!" But the child does not believe it. So wrath abideth upon him. John 3, 36. That is what Christ means when He says: "He that believeth not is condemned already." John 3, 18.

Redemption was indeed accomplished for all, but some remain in prison although bright daylight shines through the shattered gates. Rom. 8, 32; 2 Cor. 5, 14, 15; 1 Tim. 2, 6; Heb. 2, 9; 1 John 2, 2; 2 Pet. 2, 1. To such the words of Christ apply: "Ye would not!" Matt. 23, 37. This not willing to believe is the only

sin which damns under the Gospel dispensation. Therefore Christ does not say: "He that sinneth," but: "He that believeth not shall be damned." Mark. 16, 16. And the Holy Ghost was sent to "reprove the world of sin because they believe not" on the Lord Jesus, John 16, 7, 8; of no other sin, because all sins remain where this one remains, and all are remitted when this one departs. Luther says: "Nothing damns but this, that one does not accept this Savior and refuses to have Him who takes sin away. For if He were there, there would be no more sin there. Therefore the world is no longer reprov'd of . . . other sins, because Christ blotted them out, but in the New Testament only this remains sin, that one will not know and receive Him." (St. Louis Ed., XI, 868.) So much do the eyes of God consider faith.

So we believe, and God justifies. Which of the two comes first? Our faith, it seems. At least St. Paul says: "Abraham believed God, and it was counted unto him for righteousness." Rom. 4, 3. Ancient and modern errorists have concluded from this that God regards us righteous on account of the excellent qualities of our faith. Neither the one nor the other is correct; for the clear testimonies of Scripture which call *Christ* our Righteousness, Jer. 23, 6 and 1 Cor. 1, 30, are against it. And what sense would there be in Rom. 10, 4: "Christ is the end of the Law for righteousness to every one that believeth," if God regarded us righteous for the sake of any virtue? And Is. 45, 24, 25: "In the Lord have I righteousness and strength," and: "In the Lord shall all the seed of Israel be justified and shall glory." And what would become of all the testimonies concerning the atonement effected through the death of God if our faith effected it? And does not the same apostle who taught about faith as mentioned above most anxiously separate his own righteousness from the righteousness which is of God? Phil. 3, 9. How, then, dare he be charged with having considered his faith meritorious to become righteous before God? The import of the imputation of faith will become clear if we compare Acts 15, 9 with 1 John 1, 7. Acts 15, 9 it is taught that faith cleanses us; 1 John 1, 7 this is attributed to the blood of Christ. Now either John contradicts Peter in this point, or else the blood of Christ is the remedy and faith the taking of the remedy. Thus the two texts are in consonance. In fact, the Scriptural term "faith" contains both — kernel and shell. Christ's merit is the kernel; our apprehension, the shell. The shell is indeed necessary to hold the fruit on the tree, but the nourishing power of the fruit comes from the kernel. And the Holy Spirit

has especially this kernel in mind when He speaks of faith. Thus Gal. 3, 23: "Before faith came, we were kept under the Law, shut up unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed." Christ is here meant in so far as He is apprehended by faith. (Note: Our faith did not indeed make us free from the bondage of the Law, but Christ.) Likewise it is said Rom. 12, 6: "Let us prophesy according to the proportion of faith," of course, according to the content which is believed, not according to our taking. And Eph. 4, 5: "One Lord, one faith, one Baptism." That here, too, all emphasis is to be laid on the proclamation which is apprehended by faith is shown in v. 14: "That we henceforth be no more children, tossed to and fro and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men and cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive." Jude 20 we are even exhorted to build up ourselves on our *most holy faith*. Why do we not speak of our most holy love wherewith we help the poor, or of our most holy repentance? For the simple reason that the emotions of our soul do not merit such high praise; neither does our faith. But this is our most holy faith, "that Jesus Christ came into the world to save sinners." Also such texts as Acts 6, 7 belong here: "A great company of priests were obedient to the faith." This certainly means nothing else than this: they were obedient to the Gospel. Now we understand why Paul uses two words: "To him that *believeth* . . . his *faith* is counted for righteousness." Rom. 4, 5. For the faith which is counted to him for righteousness is the merit of Christ. True, faith, in the New Testament, never means the Gospel in so far as it is *not* believed, but always both: the Gospel *together* with faith which apprehends it. Likewise does the word "hope" in Scripture always embrace both: our hoping *and* God's promise. Only in so far does hope not make ashamed, whilst hope of another kind makes a fool of many a one.

Whoever, therefore, teaches that God imputes our faith for righteousness errs. (*Falsa est interpretatio, quod fides pro actu credendi sumta nobis imputetur, quia imputationis hujus unicum objectum est justitia Christi.* — Hoepfner.) Our unbelief is indeed the fundamental unrighteousness of which the world is reprovèd; the righteousness, however, which God offers to the world is not its faith, but Christ's obedience. The Lord says: "And when He [the Comforter] is come, He will reprove the world of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment: of sin, because they believe not on Me; of righteousness" — probably that they shall believe? No, but — "because I go to the Father, and ye see Me no more," John

16, 7—10. So, then, our unbelief is our unrighteousness, but our righteousness is not our faith, but Christ's going to the Father, that is, His innocent suffering and death, yes, His entire obedience. (*Transitus Christi ad Patrem est nostra justitia. Repetitio Corporis Doctrinae Christianae.* — *Luther*: "This word, 'That I go to the Father,' embraces the entire work of our redemption, . . . namely, the suffering, death, and resurrection of Christ." St. Louis Ed., XI, 897.) *Luther* says: "This going is the right eternal righteousness. Of this the world knows nothing; not a letter concerning it is found in all other books. Christ here does not say a word of what I must do or not do, but He speaks solely and only of His work that He does. That is to be our righteousness and nothing else." (St. Louis Ed., XIII, 592.) We are, therefore, not righteous for the sake of our faith, but for Christ's sake. 1 John 2, 12. But we are indeed righteous *through* faith. Rom. 3, 25, 30; Gal. 2, 16; 3, 4; Eph. 2, 8; 3, 12; Rom. 3, 28. That a diamond ring is worth a hundred dollars is caused by the stone, not by the setting, although one needs the setting in order to wear it on the finger.

But Abraham, — how is it with him? Christ's righteousness could certainly not be imputed to him, and yet he became righteous. For does not Scripture say of him: "And being not weak in faith, he considered not his own body, now dead, when he was an hundred years old, neither yet the deadness of Sarah's womb. He staggered not at the promise of God through unbelief, but was strong in faith, giving glory to God, and being fully persuaded that what He had promised He was able also to perform. And therefore it was imputed to him for righteousness"? Rom. 4, 19—22. Here it is clearly written: God promised Abraham offspring; Abraham firmly relied in the fulfilment of this promise, and God imputed *this* to him for righteousness. Therefore — so we conclude with Bellarmine — faith is a heroic act for the sake of which God regards us righteous.

Not so fast! First that legion of texts would needs have to be plucked out of the Bible which safeguards the imputed righteousness of Christ, especially the chapter of the Epistle to the Romans immediately preceding this one. Meanwhile it might be permitted to explain the second sentence of a letter by means of the first, in our case, the fourth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans by means of chapter three. For here Paul describes the curative treatment by which God makes *all* whole, by saying: "All have sinned, . . . being justified freely by His grace, through the redemption that is

in Christ Jesus." He, in His blood, is the Propitiation [*Suehnmittel* = means of propitiation], which is apprehended by faith. Rom. 3, 23—25. In this way God saved Abraham before all others. He, too, believed, not in God in general, but in that God who justifies the sinner, Rom. 4, 5; and that "was counted unto him for righteousness," Rom. 4, 3. In the following verses the apostle explains how this is to be understood. Rom. 4, 4—9. But we must apply everything that is said in these six verses of justification also to the justification of Abraham, yes, especially to Abraham's justification. For it is the beginning (Rom. 4, 2. 3) and the end (v. 9) of the entire passage. So, then, it applies to Abraham, and to Abraham first of all, that righteousness without works was imputed to him. Rom. 4, 6. Pray, which righteousness? His own? Then grace were no more grace. So, then, a foreign one. But if a foreign one, which other one than Christ's, who, according to the expressed testimony of Scripture, died also "for the transgressions that were under the first testament." Heb. 9, 15. For this righteousness, as Paul has taught a few lines above, is "being witnessed by the Law and the prophets." Rom. 3, 21. 22. But in order to remove all doubt, it is further declared that this imputed righteousness consisted in nothing else than the forgiveness of sins. Rom. 4, 7. 8. Shall we perhaps invent a new way of salvation for Abraham? Shall we say that he believed, and that, as a reward for this, God forgave his sins? This way is also barred by v. 4 with its "Grace — not of debt." Rom. 4, 4. Then nothing remains for us but the confession: Abraham's faith was imputed to him for righteousness because it apprehended Christ. Thus Abraham was saved in the same manner as we are. For this reason, and for this reason only, did St. Paul exemplify the doctrine of justification, which he unfolds in the third chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, in Abraham. First doctrine, then example. Yes, here is more than an example; here is the original (*Urbild*). For we are not commanded to believe as, among others, Abraham believed, but we are to believe after his pattern. For the history of his justification "was not written for his sake alone, . . . but for us also, to whom it shall be imputed, if we believe on Him that raised up Jesus, our Lord, from the dead." Rom. 4, 23. 24. In this sense Abraham is the father of all them that believe, not only of the circumcision, but also of the uncircumcision, Rom. 4, 11. 12. 16, because they all became righteous before God through the same righteousness as he. If he were nothing more than a model of vigorous faith, then the Mohammedans would be his most excellent children. (*To be continued.*)

The Historical Significance of the Formula of Concord.

PROF. R. W. HEINTZE, St. Louis, Mo.

II.

Four months after Luther's death, Duke Maurice of Saxony, in a secret treaty, made an agreement with the emperor to the effect that his administration would submit to the decrees of the Council of Trent, which had begun its sessions. A few days later the Pope contracted with the emperor that the latter begin to exterminate Protestantism; and in case this should lead to war, he was to receive considerable financial help from the Holy Father. Charles, whose world policy dominated his handling of local questions, by this time had his hands free to assert himself in the administration of German affairs. He determined upon a policy of strictly holding the members of the empire to the agreements they had made or to the edicts he had given. The Smalcald War was termed by him a punitive expedition to avenge the violations of the Regensburg agreement. His victorious conclusion of the war filled him with confidence for future undertakings as regarded both his relations with the Pope and with the German princes and governments. With skill and firmness he worked at the plan of bringing the council, which had adjourned to Bologna, back to Trent. With grim determination he worked at the plan of making the Protestant estates willing henceforth to be represented at the council. The Elector of Saxony, the head of the vanquished Smalcald Alliance, was outlawed, and Duke Maurice was appointed executioner and rewarded with the land and the office of the victim. Yet Maurice was not willing that the next diet should go on record as indorsing the emperor's council idea. Subsequent developments showed the Pope to be rather reluctant to fetch the emperor's chestnuts out of the oven; not until 1551 did the council meet again at Trent. On the other hand, in spite of Regensburg and in spite of the war the adherents of Rome among the German churches had sunk to 10 per cent., 70 per cent. being under Lutheran and 20 per cent. under Reformed administration. Further growth at least must be prevented. Since the ecclesiastic forces did not function quickly enough, Charles himself undertook to reduce the march of Protestantism to "marking time."

In February, 1548, before the Diet of Augsburg, Charles gathered a few government representatives of Catholic and of Protestant sections who were to propose ways and means of secur-

ing at least a temporary unity. When these officials could not agree, he appointed Bishop Pflug of Naumburg, Bishop Holding of Mayence, and the Protestant John Agricola of the Brandenburg court a commission for the same purpose. These three agreed on the basis of a memorial brought along by Pflug. Before bringing it before the diet, Charles secretly submitted it to the Protestant electors and to eminent Catholic members of the diet, among them Duke William of Bavaria. Maurice refused assent. Brandenburg and the Palatinate assented because poor Agricola had thought the document to be merely a sort of armistice binding on all parties. The proposition was adopted by the diet, and its embodiment in the minutes, in summer of 1548, constituted it a law for the width and breadth of the land. It is the Augsburg Interim.¹⁾ However, before this official recording, in the middle of May, Charles had had a sort of meeting of the estates in his lodging. The introduction to the document contained an admonition to the Romanists loyally to adhere to the doctrines and institutions of the "old Church" and an admonition for the Protestants either to return to the "old faith" or to act according to the Interim.

The twenty-six articles of the Interim partly define articles of faith and partly describe and prescribe rules of life and for public worship. They treat of man before and after the Fall, of redemption by Christ, of justification, of Christian love and good works, of confidence in forgiveness of sin, of churches and the marks of true churches, of the power and the servants of the churches, of the supreme bishop and other bishops, of the seven sacraments (Baptism, confirmation, penitence, Communion, extreme unction, holy orders, matrimony), of the sacrifice of the Mass, of the saints, of the memory of the dead, of communion with the Mass, of ceremonies, and of the use of the Sacraments. The phrases used to indicate what until further notice was to be taught concerning justification were so skilfully worded that both the Romanist and the Lutheran conception might be covered by them as far as they went. But everybody knew that the same terms did not mean the same thing to the papal theologians as they did to those of the evangelical Church. Furthermore, the carefully chosen compromise was felt to cast a shadow on this all-important part of the Lutheran faith and to obscure it. Asquiescence in the Augsburg Interim, as far as the statement about the way to eternal life was concerned, was equivalent to revocation.

1) Druffel, *Briefe u. Akten z. Gesch. d. 16. Jahrh.*, v. 3, p. 42 ff. *Dtsche Ztschr. f. Gesch. wiss.*, N. F., v. 2, p. 39 ff.

The reception given the Interim was denouncement both in Rome and in Germany. In Rome there was chagrin because the emperor had undertaken to write a confession of faith, which was not a civil function. Besides, the document made concessions to the Protestants which the hierarchy was not willing to make. Communion *sub utraque* was to be permitted, and marriage of the clergy was not to remove the incumbent. The hierarchy did not consider the fact that the Hussites had been granted the *utraque* when Rome could not help herself, and that in spite of Constance. Nor did they consider the fact that exceptions to celibacy had been granted before. The point was that Rome did not intend to make such exceptions any more; that she was determined to set up a set of iron-clad definitions of dogma and practise, all of which was to be entirely in harmony with the development of the papacy that she was bending every effort to interpret every neutral statement in line with her position.

Of course, her fear as to possible imperial thoughts of compromise or imperial plans of tolerance was groundless. Charles's plan was merely to throw a sop to the Protestant party. The Interim was terminated by the Treaty of Passau, which was turned into the Religious Peace of Augsburg, 1555. Here legal recognition was granted to the Church of Rome *and* the Church of the Augsburg Confession. But when, in the early fifties, Charles saw his power dwindle and the ship of state drifting toward toleration, that course was so objectionable to him that he chose to abdicate. Much less could he have had plans of tolerance in 1548, when he was at the pinnacle of his power. No, the time of the Interim was sedulously to be employed to force back those seven-tenths of his German realm into the *milieu*, the atmosphere, the habits, and the garments which they had gotten away from and to force upon the estates the recognition of the imperial *power*. His plan was to have his son Philip follow his brother Ferdinand and to leave to the Spaniard a Holy Roman Empire united politically as well as ecclesiastically — one country, one monarch, one Church.

So the Germans had to learn Spanish ways. Circumspectly, relentlessly, brusquely, Charles set about to have the authorities enforce the Interim.

What did the Protestant authorities think about it? In the modern Bavarian Palatinate on the Rhine there was a little conglomeration of cities ruled by young Wolfgang of Zweibruecken. When his deputy at the Diet of Augsburg heard about the proposed Interim, he immediately reported back, "Our religion is done for."

Wolfgang's other representative was present at that meeting in the imperial lodging and protested, almost the only one.²⁾ In a touching letter Wolfgang explained to Charles why he could not accept the Interim. By parents and guardians he had been trained in the religion of the Augsburg Confession, and he believed it to be the true religion. He would willingly obey the emperor in temporal matters; but would not His Majesty kindly consider how hard it is for any one with the fear of God in his heart to give up his religious conviction? He was earnestly considering with his counselors what parts of the Augsburg decree could be accepted with good conscience, and since it was a very important affair, he asked for some time to consider it (this was early in June).³⁾ Charles commanded his presence at Augsburg, where he arrived two days after adjournment. On the way he had found that two thousand Spanish soldiers were billeted in Heilbronn, ready to lend emphasis to Charles's arguments. In an interview with the emperor the twenty-two-year-old prince begged him to spare his conscience for God's sake and to relieve him at least of some requirements of the act. In vain. His clergy commission reported that the prescribed doctrine of the Interim, in all things that touched upon salvation, came close enough to the doctrine prevailing in his realm, while others, *e. g.*, the statement on good works, penance, transubstantiation, were decidedly to be rejected. They imagined that a way out could be found by proclaiming, as before, the teaching of the Bible without attacking the Interim. Some of the Catholic ceremonies might be introduced, namely, such as were adiaphora. But they emphatically declared against the reintroduction of the Mass. Communion might be celebrated every Sunday and holiday, also twice or three times a week, but not without the presence of some communicants. The required sacerdotal garments for the Mass might be worn by the clergy after preparing the people for the new spectacle. Corpus Christi processions were totally rejected, while they were ready to obey precepts of fasting if given by the government as civic ordinances. Continually prodded by Charles, the young prince explained to his pastors the duress of the situation and submitted the question to them whether they would be willing to act according to the Interim, telling them that otherwise the emperor would force them to give up their charges. And when their refusal was reported to the bishops and the bishops themselves

2) K. Menzel, *Wolfgang v. Zweibruecken*. Muenchen. 1893.

3) The letter is given in Druffel, p. 117.

were to furnish men willing to carry out the demands of the new law, the Archbishop of Mayence replied the best thing for Wolfgang, as well as for his preachers and his subjects, would be to return to the "mother" Church.⁴⁾

It is remarkable with what speed the imperial chancellery conducted its correspondence about the enforcement of the Augsburg law. In the archbishopric Cologne ten months had elapsed between the deposition of the former and the appointment of the new prelate. In its territory was the city of Lippstadt, ruled by Count Simon and Count Bernard. On the very same day which witnessed the enactment into law of the Interim, Charles directed a letter to these two, demanding the immediate submission under the act (June 30, 1548). The dates, after three months of negotiations, are October 11, 23, and 29, November 7, 10, and 12. The last-named date is the day when the ministers who could not submit had to leave the city.⁵⁾

In the territory of Cardinal Otto of Augsburg there were places which, like Nuremberg, had hopes of a modification of the Interim.⁶⁾ July 7 the emperor urged a quicker pace and demanded that recalcitrants be penalized and that orating against the decree be stopped. In the city councils the Protestants were in the majority; but they were elderly men, who gradually were supplanted by men of the new generation who knew nothing of the sigh of relief with which their elders, twenty-seven years previous, had welcomed the new-old message. The neighborhood had suffered severely from Spanish troops in the late war. The council feared for their citizenry and started the enforcement. But they also had to reckon with public opinion and therefore sent out questionnaires.⁷⁾ Though the result of this straw vote caused the council to issue quieting assurances, such assurances were always followed by stricter methods. August 11⁸⁾ fasting in Lent and on Fridays and Saturdays was ordered under severe penalties; masses were provided for, confession to the priest was to be made; Protestant baptisms were forbidden. In December, 1548, Cardinal Otto was asked by Charles to enforce the Interim in his diocese. Otto was an indefatigable and most energetic champion for the Curia, determined to win back the evangelical parts of his territory.

4) Menzel, pp. 81—85.

5) H. Niemoeller, *Ref.-Gesch. von Lippstadt*; Halle, 1906.

6) *Corp. Ref.*, 7, 81.

7) Beck, *Beitr. z. Regiments- u. Verfassungsgesch.*, 1882, p. 38.

8) Beck. Other reports give different dates.

Pleading for support on the part of the secular power for his "Christian purpose," he circularized — all towns? No, only the Protestant towns. In the circular he not only demanded obedience to the Interim, but frequent reports as to how it was obeyed: whether their clergy had received Roman ordination, whether extreme unction was applied in the Roman way; whether penance was made; whether Mass was read according to the old traditional form; how and to whom Communion was administered; whether masses for the dead were read. By November, 1549, the main churches were entirely given over to the full Catholic cult. The Protestant Communion altar was destroyed, and a Roman Catholic high altar was erected. Lutherans were excommunicated. That does not look like the establishment of a temporary *modus vivendi*.

The emperor had written to the German bishops: "The masses shall not depend on their own judgment more than is right, but shall submit to the judgment of the emperor."⁹) Quite in harmony with this was the action of several city councils in this diocese: religion seemed to them a police affair. In Dinkelsbuehl,¹⁰) within three years, 2,000 gulden were imposed as fine on Protestants for having taken babies to Lutheran pastors for baptism. Over a hundred citizens were exiled. When Lutheran inhabitants began to visit churches of their faith in neighboring towns, the bishop forbade worship outside of the city limits and demanded that the Roman services be attended by the Protestants.

These miniatures are not presented on account of cruel treatment shown. They prove that the Augsburg legislation in reality, practically, was a whip to drive sheep gone astray back into the fold.

The move was not successful, for the law found stubborn resistance in most territories. Philip of Hessen was willing to accept it as a price for regaining his liberty. John Frederick of Saxony, also a prisoner, steadfastly refused. The North German free cities, Pomerania, Mecklenburg, Saxony, the Palatinate, Brandenburg, and other states refused to introduce the Interim as it read. Many, many considered the slightest concession to Charles a betrayal of their faith. Almost all the prominent Lutheran theologians denounced it. Philip Melancthon wrote *Bedenken aufs Interim*, 32 pages; Osiander, his *Bedenken auf das Interim, seinem erbarn Radt seiner Oberkeit ueberreicht*, 44 pages; Amsdorf, *Antwort, Glaub und Bekenntnis auf das schoene und liebliche*

9) Druffel, I, No. 300.

10) Buerkstuemmer, p. 134.

Interim, 40 pages; E. Alber, *Ein Dialogus oder Gespraech etlicher Personen vom Interim*, 128 pages; C. Aquila, *Wider den spoettischen Luegner und unverschempten verleumbder M. Eislebium Agricolam. Noetige verantwortung und ernstliche warnung wider das Interim*, 12 pages; C. Azaria, *Wider den schnoeden Teuffel, der sich itzt abermals in einen Engel des Lichts verkleidet hat, das ist, wider das neue Interim*, 24 pages; *Bekenntnisse und Erklarunge up dat Interim dorch der erbarn Stede* [cities] *Luebeck, Hamborch, Luenenborch . . . Superintendenten* (I. Crepinus), printed in Hamburg and Magdeburg. Also caricaturists and satirists lent pencil and pen to decry the ukase; e. g., *Pasquillus continens analysin seu expositionem adverbii Interim, quae est pars indeclinabilis a Satana et eius squamis elaborata ad animarum interitum*, and *Declinatio adverbii Interim: Interim, quae pars? Adverbium. Quid est adverbium? Est verbum Satanae coniunctum cum Verbo Dei ad decipiendas animas*.¹¹⁾ And the many doggerels with *Interim* — *Schalk hinter ihm*. Of course, such pasquils do not necessarily indicate depth of feeling, but they do show the spreading of interest taken in the matter.

Various things were attacked in such publications. S. Cephalus, in a booklet of 76 pages, furnishes "proof that those are wrong who forbid polemics against Antichrist's papacy with its horrors." Some railed against the claim that the exigencies of the times demanded acceptance; e. g., Amsdorf in *Dass itzund die rechte zeit sei, Christum und sein Wort zu bekennen, und auf keine andre zu warten sei*. The most active and most vehement writer probably was Matthias Flacius Illyricus (native of Istria), a colleague of Melancthon. But his darts were particularly directed against another interim; e. g., his *Wider den Auszug des Leipsischen Interim oder das kleine Interim*, Magdeburg 1549, 16 pages.

It will be remembered that Maurice of Saxony was not ready to have the Augsburg decree carried out in his lands. But in a series of conferences with the most noted members of his legislature and with a number of theologians (at Meissen, Torgau, Altzella) a document was framed which was to show how far the wishes of the emperor could be met without disloyalty to their faith. In December, 1548, the Saxon legislature accepted the document¹²⁾ at Leipzig, the Leipzig Interim. A new set of church principles

11) O. Melander, *Joco-Seria*, p. 663, quoted in Frank's *Gesch. d. prot. Theol.*

12) A full English translation is given in Jacobs's *Book of Concord*, Vol. 2, pp. 261—272.

(*Kirchenordnung*) based on this document remained unpublished because the papal and the imperial administration refused to acknowledge Maurice's right to make independent alterations in the Augsburg agreement. Summarizing excerpts of the Leipzig resolutions were to be issued piecemeal (the Short Interim, *das kleine Interim*). This modification of the Augsburg plan "maintained" the Lutheran standpoint on justification, sanctification, etc., but offered to yield to the Roman Church as far as ceremonies and neutral matters were concerned. The Lutherans were to promise to tolerate or even reintroduce the Mass (in Latin, excepting the reading of the Gospel-lesson), confirmation by the bishop, prescribed clerical dress, images, holidays, and fasting. The action of the Leipzig legislature was hastened by reports from the South to the effect that four hundred Protestant ministers had been exiled or dismissed by timid magistrates.

Melanchthon, at that time, though repelled by the Augsburg book, that "peace between sheep and wolves," ready to die rather than approve the "Augsburg Sphinx," yet also had the principle that no one must lend a hand in devastating his country and turning the Church into a desert. That led him to give weight to external consideration in deciding questions of conscience. Nine years before he had published a little volume, *Vom ampt der weltlichen Fuersten, das in [ihnen] aus befelh des wort Gottes gebueren woell, alle Misbreuch in iren Kirchen abzuthun*. Now, officially, as head of the Wittenberg University, he advised his prince to give the public worship in his land and the relation between people and Church and between people and pastor such color and shape and temperature as would hardly distinguish them from those of the papacy.¹³⁾

Lutheran opponents asked, "Would *Luther* have taken such a position?" Did their former Elector John Frederick show such an attitude? A thousand voices thundered, No! And Melanchthon was charged with counterfeiting Lutheranism. Flacius, on his knees before the Wittenberg faculty, had pleaded with it to remain firm. During the conference at Altzell he vainly had urged the rector of the university to have the *corpus academicum* publish an official resolution against yielding in matters of religion. He wrote — spoken words are evanescent — to his colleague Melanchthon, calling upon him brusquely not to compromise the school which had been a distributor of truth, by concessions to the "god-

13) *Etiamsi non probabo, tamen vel tacebo, vel cedam, vel feram quidquid accidet.* (*Corp. Ref.*, VI, 880.)

less Ahithophels and servants of Antichrist.”¹⁴) Melanchthon had not taken the advice and the gifted, high-minded young teacher of Hebrew, Flacius, who had been a beloved guest in the home of Melanchthon, whom he greatly admired, protested by giving up his position at the university and leaving the city without any prospect of future income. Magdeburg, where he settled, became the “chancellery of God.” The opposition to the Leipzig Interim became opposition to Melanchthon and his adherents and was organized by Flacius: Philippists against Gnesio-Lutherans (gnesio = original, genuine). The issue was the assertion of Flacius that the admission of the Catholic ceremonial had violated the essence of Protestantism. In his *De Veris et Falsis Adiaphoris* the Illyrian argues: An adiaphoron is a thing which in its nature is indifferent. In religion the various parts of order of worship belong here (*adiaphora ecclesiastica*). When there is an expressed command of God concerning such, the thing is settled; if not, the Church may decide on such as tend to help build up the true faith. When “adiaphora” are not constructive, but destructive, they lose their character as adiaphora. The Leipzig Interim has introduced such. It reckons among adiaphora, things that do not belong there because they are contrary to God’s Word;¹⁵) *e. g.*, conceding to Antichrist the rule of the Church, distinguishing between Mass and Communion, polytheism in veneration of saints, multiplicity of Christs in the persons of the priests, extreme unction and holy orders as sacraments. And what in the Interim really is adiaphoron has been violently foisted upon the Church against her will and has thus lost its character of being a matter indifferent.

Even when, a few years later, the Interim had been abolished, polemics continued. And though Melanchthon wrote¹⁶) an admission that he had been wrong (*Vincite! Cedo; fateor hac in re a me peccatum esse*), the leader of the Gnesio-Lutherans, not satisfied with the victory of the truth, insisted on humiliating public retractions.¹⁷) Two things stand out in these years. The one is the blindness of the defenders of the Interim, who did not foresee

14) *Epistola M. F. Ill. coram exhibita Dr. Philippo ante Celensia comitia.*

15) Calvin, in a letter to Melanchthon, took the same position: “*Adde quod eorum, quae tu media facis, quaedam cum Dei Verbo manifeste pugnat.*” (*Ep. ad Mel.*, 1551.)

16) *Corp. Ref.*, VIII, 839.

17) Cp. the Coswick Action in *Corp. Ref.*, IX, 23.

the psychological effect on their parishioners if they were to be accustomed for years to a form of church-life which for centuries had spelled papacy. The other is the formation of theological parties within the Church, both covered by the Augsburg Confession, the two catechisms of Luther, and the Smalcald Articles. Were these symbols, perhaps, not sufficient? *(To be continued.)*

Confession and the Confessional.

REV. GEO. LUECKE, M. A., Columbia, Pa.

Discussion of the subject "Confession and the Confessional" has occupied considerable space of late in both the religious and the secular press of the country. This has been occasioned, on the one hand, by the declaration of the Archliberal and Modernist Harry Emerson Fosdick in favor of the confessional, and, on the other, by the sensational trial in North Carolina of a young woman on the charge of having murdered her father, on the strength of the revelation made to the civil authorities by an evangelist to whom she had confessed the crime. No doubt, also in our circles interest in this question was aroused by these happenings, and a discussion of it in these columns would therefore seem both timely and appropriate.

Dr. Fosdick's statement in favor of the confessional is quoted as follows in the *Literary Digest* of December 12, 1927: —

"The confessional, which Protestantism threw out the door, is coming back through the window, in utterly new forms, to be sure, with new methods and with an entirely new intellectual explanation appropriate to the Protestant churches, but motived by a real determination to help meet the inward problems of individuals.

"Clergymen are giving different names to this form of activity, such as 'trouble clinics,' 'personal conferences on spiritual problems,' 'the Protestant confessional.' The name makes little difference. What does matter is the renewed awareness in the churches that they are in danger of surrendering to the psychoanalyst that vast field of human needs where the confession of sin and spiritual misery is met with sympathetic and intelligent treatment. To be sure, a wise minister will work with a psychiatrist, not without one; but if the churches substitute any other kind of success for the successful handling of the spiritual aspects of individual problems, they will be vacating their most obvious function."

This statement, in the first place, calls for some correction.

When Fosdick says that "Protestantism threw the confessional out the door," he overlooks the Lutheran Church, which retained both confession and absolution. Luther, "the conservative Reformer," showed his conservatism also in this particular, that, while his radical contemporaries, Zwingli, Carlstadt, Calvin, and others, "threw the confessional out the door," he retained it, only purging it of the abuses to which it had been subjected under popery. In the Romish Church confession of every "mortal" sin to a priest is made a part of the "sacrament of penance" and is inculcated as necessary for salvation. This compulsory character of the act Luther denounced as "making a torture of confession." But he retained private confession before Communion as a salutary and blessed ordinance, particularly on account of the special consolation brought to the individual Christian by the private absolution connected intimately with confession. It is true, however, that private confession and absolution has, in the course of time, fallen largely into disuse also in our Lutheran Church, and that public, or general, confession and absolution has largely taken its place. Perhaps this is to be regretted. But I believe that, while the form has been lost, the substance of the private confessional—that for which Dr. Fosdick pleads—has been largely retained in our Lutheran congregations. Our pastors are still, in a large measure, looked upon as spiritual fathers and advisers by their members and are freely consulted as such in questions of conscience and other spiritual difficulties. And this certainly is a form of "confessional." I am reminded here of a conversation on religious questions between a young pastor of our Synod and several young ladies, in the course of which the pastor also spoke of the habit which his members have of consulting him in matters of conscience and religion, whereupon one of the young ladies, a Presbyterian, remarked that she had never thought of her pastor in the rôle of spiritual adviser; that, while she liked very much to meet him socially, she would never think of going to him with her troubles. I believe this, in a large measure, shows the difference—outside of the pulpit!—between our Lutheran pastors and those of other Protestant churches: Our pastors are, as a rule, real *Seelsorger*, while those of other churches are largely mere social "mixers," as far as intercourse with their people is concerned.

Still I believe that Fosdick's plea for a wider use of the "confessional" may well be heeded also in our circles. For no doubt there is room, much room, for improvement also among us

in this particular. Our people, too, do not, on the whole, appreciate as they should the blessed privilege which they enjoy in going to their pastor as their spiritual father and opening their hearts and pouring out their troubles to him. It is a proverbial axiom that troubles and heartaches, when shared with a friend, are cut in half; and surely it needs no proof that the pastor is, or ought to be, the best friend of his parishioners, to whom any of them ought to feel perfectly safe in communicating their confidences, and on whose judgment and advice they should place the utmost reliance, as well as on his ability to comfort, reassure, correct, or warn them, as the case may be. All this aside from the Scriptural teaching that the pastor, "as a called minister of Christ" and "an ordained servant of the Word," is delegated and authorized "in the stead and by the command of Christ" to absolve sinners and assure them of forgiveness, and that such absolution and assurance, privately and individually given, is of peculiar force and calculated to confer particular comfort. Also in this the Savior has shown His wonderful wisdom and His transcending love for sinners. Certainly, then, we pastors ought to employ every means and utilize every opportunity for encouraging our members in their use of this blessed institution, and we should never grow weary of doing so. Perhaps it will not be amiss, and it may not be unnecessary, to add that we ourselves should not neglect it. That is also one purpose of our pastoral conferences, to exchange confidences, to get advice on difficult questions of conscience, to administer to one another consolation, correction, and, if necessary, also warning and reproof. Also in this particular the apostle's exhortation to the Galatian Christians finds its application: "Bear ye one another's burdens and so fulfil the law of Christ," *i. e.*, the law of love. Gal. 6, 2.

Of course, the Scriptural view of confession and absolution has no appeal for Dr. Fosdick, Liberal and Radical that he is. Quite naturally, therefore, he does not base his plea for the introduction of the confessional into Protestant churches on considerations resting on revealed truth, but merely urges them for utilitarian considerations. Hence we are not surprised to find him advocating, in connection with it, his vagary that "a wise minister will work with a psychiatrist" in the confessional. In the first place, a "wise minister," one who studies human nature and has frequent experience in handling these troublous questions of his parishioners, ought in a short time to become a fairly good "psychiatrist" himself, even though he has not made a special study of the modern sciences

of psychology and psychoanalysis. And, moreover, the great majority of problems submitted to him or calling for his decision are not to be solved by the rules of psychology or psychoanalysis, but by the rules laid down in the Bible. Accordingly, while Dr. Fosdick deserves credit for his keen insight into the needs of the human soul for sharing its troubles with others and for his readiness to recognize this need and to make provision for it in the Church, his plea for the introduction of the confessional, on the other hand, does not flow from regard for Christ's injunction and the dictates of God's Word in general. His recommendation is motivated, not by Biblical, but solely by humanitarian considerations. —

And now for the second phase of the subject, the secrecy, or sanctity, of the confessional, as brought to the front by the North Carolina tragedy. (The theologians call this *sigillum confessionis*, "the seal of the confessional.") The facts in the case are briefly these: A Baptist revivalist, the Rev. Thomas F. Pardue, in a series of services held at Reidsville, N. C., had preached a sermon last spring on "the necessity of confession of sin." Immediately after the service in which this sermon was preached, a young married woman, Mrs. Gatlin, wife of the town's fire chief, went to the evangelist and, no doubt under the mental stress caused by hearing this sermon, confessed to him that she had murdered her father some months before and had hidden his body in a shallow grave in the cellar of their home. The minister thereupon went to the civil authorities and revealed to them the subject-matter of this confession. Upon investigation the body was found in the cellar, and naturally the woman was then indicted on a charge of first-degree murder, as North Carolina has no law guaranteeing the secrecy of the confessional and excusing a Gospel minister from testifying under such circumstances. During the trial the evangelist sought to justify his action of revealing the crime by stating that he felt it his duty to the State to do so, and his counsel endeavored to bolster up this plea with the additional assertion that if the Rev. Pardue had kept the secret to himself and the crime had leaked out in some other way, he would have been held to be an accomplice to the deed. The counsel for defense, on the other hand, affirmed that the minister should have treated the confession as an inviolable secret and that his revelation of it was merely a "publicity stunt." The young woman, in her testimony, claimed that her confession was really "hypothetical"; that she confessed to having committed the crime merely to shield her dead

mother's name, who was the murderess, but who had since died. This testimony was corroborated by that of her sixteen-year-old brother, who claimed to have been an eye-witness to the deed. In his instruction to the jury the judge showed the possibility of three verdicts — first-degree murder, second-degree murder, and not guilty. A verdict of "not guilty" was returned. — Of course, we are here concerned only with the part which the evangelist played in the matter.

Now, what shall we say to the evangelist's action? Two things, it seems to me, mainly call for comment. One is his sermon on "the necessity of confession of sin," which elicited the confession of the crime from the young woman. I have not seen a summary of the sermon and hence cannot say whether it stressed the necessity of confessing sin to a pastor in order to obtain forgiveness for it. If the evangelist spoke in this fashion, he simply preached the old Romish heresy mentioned above. Scripture nowhere makes forgiveness of any sin contingent upon its confession to the "confessor." Confession of our sins to God alone is necessary for that. While confession to the pastor or to any fellow-Christian who enjoys our confidence is often very useful and salutary, the only case in which we must confess our faults to any man is when we have sinned against him directly or given offense to him.

The second point that needs elucidation is the act of the evangelist in revealing the contents of the woman's confession to the authorities. His claim is that in his conscience he felt duty-bound to bring the crime thus confessed to their notice in order to insure its punishment. While he may have been sincere in this conviction, it still remains true that he was wrong in his opinion and that it was based upon a misinformed conscience. Evidently he was laboring under the prevalent view of the Reformed sects, according to which they cannot distinguish between the duties and functions of Church and State. The confession of this crime was made to him as to a functionary of the Church, and his duties as such were performed when he had shown to the woman the enormity of her guilt and, judging her truly penitent, had assured her of the forgiveness of her sin. As pastor, this ended his duty in the matter. If as a citizen he felt a duty toward the State in the matter, he might have urged her to give herself up to the authorities; but he had no right to make the revelation himself. While there is no word of Scripture enjoining this inviolability of the confessional, as little as there is a Scriptural command for private confession to a pastor, this inviolability is based upon an understanding,

expressed or implied, between the confessor and the confessing Christian that the confession is made confidentially. Therefore Luther rightly states that even the confession of a crime by a parishioner dare not be revealed and that a pastor must refuse to bear testimony in court with reference to it, even when called upon to do so. He even went so far as to declare that a certain monk who had allowed himself to be bribed into such a revelation had been justly condemned to death. Even ordinary confidences in every-day intercourse should be considered sacred, and to reveal them betrays a mean spirit. "A talebearer revealeth secrets; but he that is of a faithful spirit concealeth the matter." Prov. 11, 13. And in particular, we are not to peddle the private sins and shortcomings of the brother which may come to our notice about the neighborhood. "If thy brother trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault *between thee and him alone.*" Matt. 18, 15. How much greater, then, is the inviolability of the sacred confidences made in the confessional! — And it may be added: In view of this mutual understanding between pastor and parishioner the latter may and should feel perfectly free and safe in confiding his sins and troubles to the former, and also we pastors need have no hesitancy in encouraging them to make liberal use of this blessed privilege.

THE THEOLOGICAL OBSERVER.

Is the Christian Church Invisible? — In our April issue we made favorable mention of some remarks which Dr. Elert (Erlangen) uttered in the course of an address on Article VII of the Augsburg Confession, printed in part in the *Lutheran*. The *Lutheran* of March 8 brings another section of that address, which, we are sorry to say, we cannot describe as satisfactory. In this instalment the Erlangen dogmatician discusses chiefly the question whether the Church is invisible or not. The *Lutheran*, inserting special subheads at various places, superscribes one of the paragraphs thus: "Church Visible and Invisible — a Calvinistic Idea." It is but fair to note that Dr. Elert himself does not stigmatize the teaching of the Church's invisibility as Calvinistic. The *Lutheran* ascribes a view to him which is not warranted by what he says in the address submitted. Here are the *ipsissima verba* of the Doctor, on which presumably the subhead in the *Lutheran* is based: "In the first place, nothing is said of a visible or an invisible Church. Theologians are still met with to-day who hold this differentiation to be one that is specifically Lutheran. But it is a necessary essential alone for the Reformed doctrine. There this differentiation can well be understood as the result of the predominant place accorded predestination

and to the answers accorded the question of the salvation of men cognate with this." The Catechism of Geneva defines the Church as "the body and congregation of believers whom God has predestinated to eternal life. . . . The Catechism of Geneva therefore quite consistently adds that this true Church can never be recognized by the sight of the eyes nor be manifested by definite marks." Dr. Elert here merely denies that the teaching of the Church's invisibility is *specifically* Lutheran and that it is a necessary essential for Lutheran teaching. But here our defense of him perforce ceases. He clearly rejects the teaching that the Church is invisible. Toward the end of the instalment he says: "Even in so far as the Church is the congregation of believers, is it impossible to speak of invisibility." What is so disappointing is the fact that Dr. Elert approaches the subject like an architect who has to decide whether a certain feature proposed for a building would mar the symmetry of that building or not. He ought to have come as a disciple of Jesus, asking in all simplicity, What is written? Studying the Scriptures, he would have found that the kingdom of God, which is but another name for the Christian Church, is invisible; for Christ says, Luke 17, 21: "The kingdom of God cometh not with observation, neither shall they say, Lo, here! or, Lo, there! For, behold, the kingdom of God is within you." To point out how well a doctrine fits into the body of Christian teaching is edifying and helpful, but it can never furnish the deciding argument for acceptance of that doctrine; the Word of God alone can do that. We are, furthermore, by no means willing to grant that the doctrine of the invisibility of the Church is an idle one which might be dispensed with, as Dr. Elert asserts. This doctrine is the great bulwark against the claims and aggressions of the papists and of Romanizing Protestants, who would make of the kingdom of God an outward organization or institution. It furnishes us strong consolation when affairs in the visible Church are unsatisfactory and we see some of our fondest hopes and expectations for a sound and glorious development of our church-body dashed to the ground and our soul is cast into the anguish of confusion and doubt. Dr. Elert himself admits in the address that for Luther this doctrine was of great practical importance in contradicting "the thought that the external hierarchical structure was an essential of the true Church." Has the danger vanished which existed in Luther's age? Has Rome changed? Has the craving of the human mind for outward glitter and greatness grown less? Hence, influenced both by the words of Scripture and by the consideration that we are here dealing with an important doctrine, we must continue to hold to the teaching of the old Lutheran dogmaticians that *vera et sancta electorum ecclesia manet invisibilis* (Chemnitz).

Who Is to Blame for the Compliment?—The *Western Christian Advocate* is gratified to find that "the Lutheran Church" is experiencing a change of heart. "It will be a matter of information to many of our readers to learn that the Lutheran Church is cooperating with other Protestant bodies more than ever in its history. Heretofore it

has been non-cooperative. It has gone its way, giving little concern to other denominations and manifesting bias and much narrowness. It is a great Protestant body. It could wield a great influence if it would play on the Protestant team. Hitherto it has refused to do so." The term "the Lutheran Church" is too general. A good many Lutherans refuse to accept the compliment. The synods constituting the Synodical Conference and the other conservative synods in sympathy with their position still confess to a strong bias, for the unity of the spirit, against unionism. The synods constituting the U. L. C. and the other synods in sympathy with its position, which send delegates to Lausanne and practise pulpit-fellowship whenever granted the opportunity, will be glad to hear that the *Advocate* is complimenting them on their broadness. E.

The Confession of Faith of the World's Christian Fundamentals Association. — The *Sunday-school Times*, in a recent issue, published the confession of faith of the World's Christian Fundamentals Association, the nine points of which read as follows: 1. We believe in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as verbally inspired of God and inerrant in the original writings, and that they are of supreme and final authority in faith and life. 2. We believe in one God, eternally existing in three persons, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. 3. We believe that Jesus Christ was begotten by the Holy Spirit and born of the Virgin Mary and is true God and true man. 4. We believe that man was created in the image of God, that he sinned and therefore incurred not only physical death, but also that spiritual death which is separation from God; and that all human beings are born with a sinful nature and, in the case of those who reach moral responsibility, become sinners in thought, word, and deed. 5. We believe that the Lord Jesus Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures as a representative and substitutionary sacrifice; and that all that believe in Him are justified on the ground of His shed blood. 6. We believe in the resurrection of the crucified body of our Lord, in His ascension into heaven, and in His present life there for us as High Priest and Advocate. 7. We believe in "that blessed hope," the personal premillennial and imminent return of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ. 8. We believe that all who receive by faith the Lord Jesus Christ are born again of the Holy Spirit and thereby become children of God. 9. We believe in the bodily resurrection of the just and the unjust, the everlasting felicity of the saved and the everlasting conscious punishment of the lost.

Local organizations of the World's Christian Fundamentals Association are being formed at various places, as, for example, the Christian Fundamentals Association for New England. "The impelling incentive to this move," writes the *Sunday-school Times*, "is the appalling spread of destructive Modernism and the insidious working of the 'leaven of the Sadducees' throughout the New England States." As much as the Christian believer will rejoice in the testimony of the Fundamentalists, he must nevertheless say that their confession in many places is not definite enough to rule out the errors of rationalism which have always infected the Church. Then, too, it omits the

important doctrine of the means of grace, especially that of the Sacraments; and besides, it teaches the figment of premillennialism. Fundamentalism is identified with Calvinism, which in its essential teachings is the opposite of Lutheranism. MUELLER.

What We Do Not Owe the Pilgrim Fathers. — Mr. C. Hale Sipe, a Pennsylvania lawyer and historian, rejects the statement that the Pilgrim Fathers laid a good foundation for the government of the United States. The *Lutheran Church Herald* prints a letter from this writer, parts of which we herewith reprint:—

“Woodrow Wilson expressed a great historical fact when he said: ‘However humiliating it may be to them or to us, America did not come out of New England,’ etc. Wilson then went on to say, in effect, that the characteristic mark of America is the mingling of racial stocks and that toleration which comes from the existence, side by side, of different forms of Christian belief. He pointed out that ‘America came out’ of the central colonies of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland, etc., calling attention to the fact that in these colonies, from the very first, were the mingling of racial stocks and the existence of different forms of Christian belief.

“The Swedes on the Delaware had more to do with the genuine molding of American history than had the Pilgrim Fathers of New England. With these early colonists, liberty of conscience was a historical fact, and not a mockery or a myth, as with the Pilgrim Fathers of New England. They laid the foundation for the success of William Penn’s ‘Holy Experiment’ before this great man was born. At a later day the migration from Pennsylvania into the valleys of the Ohio and Mississippi and to the West spread the Delaware and Pennsylvania influence throughout these regions.

“Well for all of us that ‘America did not come out of New England.’ Well for all of us that America did not take on the stamp of the bigotry and intolerance of the witch-hanging and Quaker-hanging Pilgrim Fathers. Let us be truly thankful that there were ‘other rocks’ than Plymouth Rock.”

“The Bane of Liberalism.” — The leading article in the *Western Christian Advocate* of January 12 carries this heading. The despairing death-bed meditations of the liberal minister here given constitute a most terrible arraignment of the theology of Modernism. We quote from the article: “The heart lesion of Liberalism is inevitable. It is a perilous thing to deal liberally with your faith. . . . Recently we had opportunity to hear an expression from a liberal minister. All his life he had preached broadly, commendably (?), even brilliantly, but never positively or assuringly. . . . When the evening time came, he was heard to say: ‘I do not see my way. I cannot understand the course I am to take. I have gone to the great depths of doubt. After the years have passed, life’s experiences have dissolved any positive faith I ever had. My confession, if I am able to interpret my own present experience, is that I am adrift on the current of life, drawing near the end, knowing not whither I am going, neither able to understand.’ This is a pathetic expression coming from a man who should have a great faith

in the evening time, who should have Jesus Christ as the Light of his life. . . . He did not build a careful highway over which he came. At the end his path is lost in bog and morass. We have come to the place where observation enables us to make this statement. This man is only one of many we have met. We have known men who made a similar confession. We were led to study their lives and have come to the conclusion that they are paying the price of a lack of a positive faith in Jesus Christ and His teaching."—There is only one thing to counteract the bane of Liberalism, and that is the old Gospel. And by the infinite grace of God the old Gospel has saved many a dying Liberal from his own damnable folly. The examples adduced in *Christliche Dogmatik*, II, 442, to show that the modern theories of the atonement will not serve the sinner in his great need, are cases in point. "In his dying moments Horace Bushnell said: 'I fear what I have written and said upon the moral idea of the atonement is misleading and will do great harm'; and, as he thought of it further, he cried: 'O Lord Jesus, I trust for mercy only in the shed blood that Thou didst offer on Calvary!' Ritschl had severely criticized Paul Gerhardt's hymn '*O Haupt voll Blut und Wunden*' as describing physical suffering; but he begged his son to repeat the last two verses of that hymn when he came to die." The late Dr. Charles A. Berry, of England, had had little use for the story of the Cross, branding the doctrine of the vicarious satisfaction "an immoral doctrine. Ministering to a woman dying in a house of ill fame, he talked to her about Jesus as the beautiful example. The woman declared, 'I don't want an example; I am a sinner.' There was no comfort for the dying sinner in the liberal theology. Berry then thought of what his mother had taught him, and he told the dying woman the old story of God's love in Christ. 'Now you are getting at it,' said the woman. 'That's what I want. That's the story for me.' Berry later, in telling the story to a brother clergyman, said, 'I got her in, and I got in myself.'" (*Theol. Mthly.*, I, 93.)
E.

The Vatican and the White House.—"Unthinking people have been made to believe by Governor Smith's *Atlantic Monthly* article and the discussion that followed it that there is no antagonism between Romanism and self-respecting popular government," writes the *Watchman-Examiner* editorially. And it continues: "We are in full accord with the *Reformed Church Messenger*, which said in discussing that famous article:—

"It will certainly require more than the declaration of one man to allay the fears of many students of history who have known of the political entanglements and aggrandizements of that Church, the official utterances of its supposedly infallible head, its open claim of 'supremacy above all states,' its intolerance toward all other forms of ecclesiastical organization, its antidemocratic structure and practises, and other unsavory and tyrannical pages in its long record. Greatly as we admire and applaud individual Catholics, the idea of giving the Vatican at Rome any closer connection with the White House in Washington than it now has will continue to be opposed

by millions. Whatever any of us may think about the justice or injustice of this attitude, it is simply a *fact*, and it will have to be faced. The history and teaching of the Catholic hierarchy have made it inevitable.”

MUELLER.

The Curtis-Reed Bill Now before Congress.—Hardly has the Smith-Towner Bill disappeared when a successor is challenging our attention. The Curtis-Reed Bill aims at establishing a Federal Department of Education. It is vigorously sponsored by the National Education Association. According to *America* the secular press is largely opposed to the bill and alive to the evils that would result if it should be adopted. The *Ohio State Journal* is quoted as saying: “Do our Ohio teachers wish to have the school dominated by politics to a far greater extent than now, to be instructed in their teaching duties by Washington politicians, to have their positions made dependent, as sooner or later they would be made, upon their political views and their political service?” Another paper voices the view that “a Federal Department of Education will result in an alarming usurpation upon the rights of the States. It will create uniform Federal standards for the local schools, it will be expensive, and it will throw the interests of the schools into the hands of politicians.” Whatever influence we can legitimately exercise we should throw into the scales against the adoption of such bills.

Glimpses from the Editor's Window.

The Indians of our country, contrary to the current view, are not dying out, if census figures can be trusted. In 1900 their number was 270,544. To-day they are said to number 349,876. May this remind us of our debt to the Red Man!

A new journal, called *Stockholm*, has appeared. Its aim is to advance the ideals which were stressed and elaborated at the Interdenominational Convention of Stockholm in 1925. Among the contributors to the first number are Archbishop Soederblom, Dr. Garvie, the Bishop of Winchester, the Bishop of Manchester, Dr. Cadman, and others. These names sufficiently indicate that the journal will not be devoted to the promulgation of the unadulterated Bible truth.

An exchange says that the U. L. C. supports 23 institutions of higher learning. A commission of experts which has been investigating these institutions has presented data which make it appear advisable to some of the leaders of the Church to amalgamate several of these institutions. In connection with the survey it has been discovered that more young people belonging to U. L. C. churches are pursuing their studies at non-Lutheran colleges than at those of their own church-body; hence the idea of having student pastors at the various state universities and other large educational institutions will be given thorough consideration.

The American Bible Society on the 1st of August, 1927, laid the cornerstone for a new Bible house in Peking. Most of the speeches of the occasion were delivered by Chinese Christians. It is certainly remarkable that in spite of all the political confusion in China the Bible Society manifested enough courage for this undertaking.

The following statement of a prosecuting attorney in Spain sheds some light on the status of religious liberty in that country. In demanding that a woman be punished who had stated as her conviction that Mary had other children besides Jesus, he said, according to the *N. L. C. B.*: “In this land it is a greater crime to insist that the Virgin Mary had other children besides Jesus than to express hatred against God Himself. The

latter could be atoned for by fourteen days' imprisonment, but the former is mockery against the teachings of the Church." The court complied with the request of the attorney and meted out a severe sentence to the defendant. Is Rome tolerant of other beliefs where she can afford to be intolerant?

Dr. Schneider's Year-book for 1927 informs the public that with respect to Germany the often heard claim of Rome's ascendancy over Protestantism in gaining converts from its rival is unfounded. There are more Roman Catholics in Germany joining Protestant churches than Protestants accepting Catholicism. In 1925, 13,591 Roman Catholics embraced Protestantism.

Certain Catholics, professedly without orders from the Vatican, are discussing the question whether there cannot be found a plan agreeable to both Italy and the Pope, according to which the latter could become a petty temporal ruler. The proponents of the idea are willing to let the papal principality be as small as can be conceived, as long as it will be granted the right of existence. We recall that Archimedes asked for just one little spot outside the earth where he might stand, and he promised to move the globe if that were given to him. Just a little spot! If Italy is wise, it will think of Archimedes before it yields to these aspirations of the Roman hierarchy.

In the Evangelical Synod, so an exchange says, Fundamentalists and Modernists are coming to blows, figuratively speaking. A new constitution has been proposed in which the confessional paragraph is the cause of heated discussions. The Fundamentalists maintain that in this paragraph grave concessions are made to unbelief. The Modernists complain that the concessions are too limited. It seems that a compromise version will be sought. May God strengthen those who are contending for the truth of the Bible!

In Germany it is proposed to change the law and the procedure relating to oaths in the court-room. The plan is to make every false statement punishable, but to exact an oath only in exceptionally urgent cases. It strikes us that this is a sensible plan, which ought to be supported by all those who are anxious to see the sanctity of the oath preserved.

Turkey seems to be preparing for another important step. Its president, Mustafa Kemal, has declared that he intends to bring about a complete separation of Church and State. According to the Constitution of Turkey, Mohammedanism is still the state religion. It may mean very much for the success of Christian missions if the respective paragraph in the constitution is changed and Mohammedanism removed from its preferred position.

Zionism may be very attractive in theory, but in practise it seems to meet with insuperable difficulties. The immigration of enthusiastic Jews into Palestine has created grave economic problems, inasmuch as the new arrivals naturally looked for work and crowded many an Arab out of his position. The unemployment problem is very pressing. The natives who are without work are bitter against the immigrants, and such immigrants as have not yet found employment are thoroughly disgruntled. The whole movement seems to be stalking on its last leg.

A kind brother has sent us a clipping giving a statement by Bernard Shaw on his belief in God. The famous Irishman wrote in 1910, in a private letter to Tolstoi: "There is a creative force constantly struggling to evolve an executive organ of godlike energy and power, that is, to achieve omnipotence and omniscience; and every man and woman born is a fresh attempt to achieve this object." What a blasphemous utterance! Unbelieving scientists have said that man was evolved from a lower stage; now comes this playwright and says that God is being evolved. We quote Shaw's words to show into what depths of folly some of our modern literati have sunk.

Some shocking figures demonstrating the ravages of alcoholism in Germany are reported in the *Lutherische Herold*. A German physician, who at the same time is professor at the University of Bonn, says that

Germany has 170,000 idiots, of whom there are 100,000 for whose deplorable condition alcohol is responsible. There are 80,000 epileptics in the various institutions of the *Reich*; of these 60,000 are the victims of the intemperance of their father. 400,000 people of Germany are considered to be toppers; 300,000 marriages are blighted, and one half million children are cast into misery by this evil.

BOOK REVIEW.

America, Wake Up! A Discussion of Present-day Issues, Offering Lutheranism's Constructive Solutions to Our Country's Problems. By *Walter A. Maier*. 16 pages. Single copies, 5 cts.; dozen, 50 cts.; 100, \$1.50; 1,000, \$12.00. (Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.)

In this tract Professor Maier, in his able and fascinating way, treats the following topics: Our Overwhelming Prosperity; Is There a Corresponding Spiritual Prosperity? America's National Sin; The Spirit of Impurity; Evidence of the Moral Breakdown; Destructive Criticism Is Futile; Modernism Weighed and Found Wanting; Failing Remedies; The Hope of Our Country; The Position of the Lutheran Church on Modern Issues. Our own church-members, as well as non-Lutherans, will profit by reading this small tract. In these days, when people are too busy to read books, a tract is the quickest and best way to get their attention. Professor Maier's tract ought to be given wide distribution and therefore ought to be purchased in quantities and distributed gratis. FRITZ.

What Lutheran Sunday-School Teachers Should Know. A Short Summary for Instructors and Pupils in Sunday-school Teachers' Meetings and Institutes. By *Paul E. Kretzmann, Ph. D., D. D.* 98 pages, 4½ × 6½. 75 cts. (Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.)

In this small book Dr. Kretzmann tells what Lutheran Sunday-school teachers should know about their office, the Bible, child study, the use of lesson material and the art of teaching, church history, and missions. We suggest that each Sunday-school teacher be supplied with a copy, and that the expense be paid out of the Sunday-school treasury. FRITZ.

Concordia Collection of Sacred Choruses and Anthems for More Ambitious Choral Organizations. No. 7: "I Know That My Redeemer Liveth." By *J. Wambsganss*. 7 pages. 20 cts. (Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.)

The average church choir can learn to sing well this brief Easter anthem, which closes with a good chorus effect. FRITZ.

Dreizehnter Synodalbericht des Nord-Illinois-Distrikts der Ev.-Luth. Synode von Missouri, Ohio und andern Staaten. 1927. 25 cts. (Order from Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.)

The paper presented by Rev. M. Wagner treats the subject, "The Year 1527 in Its Significance for the Church." The greater part of it is submitted in German, a few chapters in English. The various phases of the work and life of Luther during that year are vividly portrayed.

Synodical Proceedings. *Atlantic District.* 42 pages. 30 cts. — *Michigan District.* 72 pages. 45 cts. (Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.)

Both of these printed proceedings of synodical conventions contain the usual reports and minutes. In addition, the proceedings of the Michigan District contain two doctrinal essays, one on "Justification" (German), by Pastor L. List, and another on "Absolution" (English), by Pastor F. A. Hertwig. FRITZ.

Luther's Small Catechism. Uniform text. Newly revised and edited by an Intersynodical Committee. A jubilee-offering for the four-hundredth anniversary of the original publication of the Small Catechism. Provisional Edition. 32 pages. 25 cts. (The Lutheran Book Concern, Columbus, O.) Order from Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.

This new translation of Luther's Small Catechism is the fruit of a movement which began in 1922, when the Norwegian Lutheran Church resolved that "a jubilee edition of Luther's Small Catechism be printed" and that negotiations should be begun "with other Lutheran church-bodies with the view of editing a uniform English text of the Catechism." This translation is now being submitted for study and criticism to the pastors of all Lutheran churches in our country, outside our own, and for this reason a "provisional edition" has been published. Although our Synod declined to cooperate in the endeavor, it is nevertheless a matter of such paramount importance that our pastors would do well in ordering and critically examining the new version. Besides many advantages, the proposed version contains also many serious disadvantages, which cannot be stated in a brief review, but must be reserved for a more lengthy article. Of great help in the study of the translation is the careful perusal of the "Foreword," which not only explains the historical background of the movement, but also expounds the principles by which the translators were guided. The Office of the Keys has been omitted from this catechism on the ground that it was not written by Luther. For the same reason the threat in the Second Commandment as also the promise in the Fourth Commandment were omitted. In the Third Commandment Luther's words, "Thou shalt sanctify the holy-day," have been replaced by, "Remember the Sabbath-day to keep it holy." The far-reaching import of these changes is easily conceived. The changes in the text itself are so numerous that we must refrain from even mentioning them in this review. In general, however, they cannot be said to constitute an improvement on the text current in our circles. Nevertheless, on account of the importance of the matter the translation is worth a careful examination and critical study. MUELLER.

A Manual Grammar of the Greek New Testament. By *H. E. Dana and Julius R. Mantey.* 356 pages, 5½×8. \$4.00. (The Macmillan Company, New York.) Order through Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.

Good sermonizing can be done only on the basis of thorough and sound exegesis. This requires that the original source be studied. Dr. Machen of Princeton said in 1918: "There was never a time when a knowledge of the

Greek New Testament was quite so important as it is to-day. Is the Bible to be abandoned altogether to its enemies? They will study it scientifically, we may rest assured, if the Church does not." Luther says: "In proportion as we love the Gospel, let us watch over the languages. . . . We shall not long preserve the Gospel without the languages. For they are the sheath in which this Sword of the Spirit is contained; they are the casket in which one carries this jewel; they are the vessel in which one holds this wine; they are the larder in which this food is stored." (Both quotations from Ren's *Homiletics*, p. 346.) 'Tis a pity when pastors who have learned Greek and Hebrew at the college and at the seminary for the purpose of later using it in their sermon work neglect to do so and deprive themselves and their congregations of a most prolific source of sermon material.

The new *Manual Grammar of the Greek New Testament*, which left the press last November, can be highly recommended to pastors for the study of the Greek of the New Testament. The authors say in their preface: "The need most keenly felt by present-day teachers of the Greek New Testament is for an accurate and comprehensive compendium of grammar which is adaptable to the average student. This need we have attempted to supply in the following pages. The book is not offered as an exhaustive treatment of the grammatical phenomena of the Greek New Testament; for its scope and design would not permit it to be such. It is intended to give to the student a comprehensive survey of the chief features of the grammar of the Greek New Testament in simple outline form, as an introduction to a more detailed and inductive study. Our chief effort has been to bring the best Greek scholarship within reach of the average student and produce a text-book which, while being easy to comprehend, would adequately meet his needs. To this end we have made the method of presentation largely deductive, but the conclusions offered have been based upon more than a decade of careful inductive effort. In all our work of preparation we have sought to keep before us the average Greek student rather than the technical Greek scholar, at the same time endeavoring to make the book sufficiently accurate and thorough to stand the most severe tests of technical scholarship. The primary consideration which induced the authors to undertake the production of this manual was their own experience in seeking to find among the number of great treatises already in existence on the grammar of the Greek New Testament a work readily adapted to classroom use. That we need at this time another exhaustive treatise on the grammar of the Greek Testament is doubtful; that we need a practical and adaptable text-book is beyond question. Just here is where we have sought to make a worth-while contribution." We agree that they have made a "worth-while contribution." What they present is not an easy grammar for the beginner, but a real working grammar for the New Testament student. The book contains a valuable introduction with special reference to the *Koine*, the current Greek language at the time the New Testament was written. In three chapters the grammar treats the accidents of language and in twenty-six chapters its syntax. An appendix offers the following valuable material: Paradigms, Exercises for Greek Composition, English-Greek Vocabulary, English Index, Greek Index.

In the book we find such statements as: "There is conclusive proof now that the dominant meaning for *ἀντί* in the first century was *instead of*. 'By far the commonest meaning of *ἀντί* is the simple *instead of*' (Moulton-Milligan: *Voc. of the Gr. N. T.*). This statement refers to the papyri usage. Professor Whitesell (Chicago) made a study of *ἀντί* in the Septuagint and found thirty-eight passages where it is rightly translated *instead of* in the RV. Since *ἀντί* is used in two atonement passages in the New Testament, such a translation needs careful consideration." (p. 100.) But we also find that the denominational bias of the authors, as we might expect, does not remain hidden. The use of the preposition *εἰς* in Acts 2, 38, is discussed at some length. The authors claim that its use in that verse is a *causal* one. That would mean that the people who had been pricked in their hearts by Peter's Pentecostal sermon should be baptized *because they had received forgiveness of sin*. In this way the Sacrament of Baptism would be reduced to a mere empty ceremony. This, we know, is fully in accord with the teaching of the Reformed Churches, but not with the common usage of the preposition *εἰς* in the New Testament nor with the Scriptural doctrine of Baptism. Ananias said to Paul: "Arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins." Acts 22, 16. The washing away of sin was not to precede Paul's baptism, but was to be done by Baptism itself. Nor does Paul, when writing to the Galatians, say: As many as had put on Christ were baptized; but he says: "As many as upon Christ were baptized, Christ ye did put on" (literal translation). Gal. 3, 27. Peter says that even as Noah and other souls in the ark were saved by water, so "Baptism doth also now save us." What does he mean? Peter himself answers the question, saying: "Not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God." 1 Pet. 3, 20, 21. And when Paul says, Rom. 6, 4, that "we are buried with Christ by Baptism into death," he is not speaking of the mode, but of the blessing of Baptism.

FRITZ.

Luther unter vier Paepsten. Von Ernst Emil Gerfen, D. D. 104 pages. 75 cts. Order from Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.

Pastor E. Poppen, in his preface to this interesting and instructive booklet, very aptly describes its purpose and scope by saying: "There are indeed many histories of the Reformation; yet the present volume is not superfluous, but deserves to be studied in wide circles, and this for two reasons. The first concerns the importance of the matter which the book treats. What God has done for Christendom through His chosen vessel Dr. Martin Luther, and how the Church of the Pope did all it could, both when Luther lived and afterwards, to hinder and destroy this work, every Protestant and Lutheran should know; and this it is which is graphically described in the book. The other reason is the following: The author succeeded in finding a proper title, which attracts the reader, and under which he has presented the most important and interesting facts of the Lutheran Church Reformation in a concise, popular, and fascinating manner." This description of Dr. Gerfen's book is excellent; for it offers a mass of information, all of which proves that Luther was right in denouncing the Pope as the Antichrist. The book ought to be offered to the American public in English.

MUELLER.

Lutherisches Missions-Jahrbuch fuer das Jahr 1928. Herausgegeben im Auftrag der Missionskonferenz in Sachsen durch Pfarrer W. Gerber, Missionsinspektor in Leipzig. (41. Jahrgang.) M. 1. (H. G. Wallmann, Seeburgstr. 100, Leipzig.)

This is the well-known year-book of the Missions Conference of Saxony. It opens with a photograph of Dr. Carl Paul, deceased, and a brief article *in memoriam*, recounting the significance of this leader for the cause of missions. The usual valuable statistical material, especially on the activities of German and Scandinavian mission organizations, is submitted. Among the articles there is one of special interest for us written by Prof. Dr. Westman, Upsala, on "The Revolution and the Lutheran Church of China."

Grundriss der neutestamentlichen Theologie. Von Theo. Zahn. In paper covers, M. 4.80; bound, M. 6. (E. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, Dr. Werner Scholl, Leipzig.)

Who would not like to peruse and study a work on New Testament theology written by the greatest living New Testament scholar? Dr. Zahn was asked by his former students for permission to publish the notes which they had taken when attending his lectures on this subject, and he finally consented. The preface shows that essentially only the matter dictated to the students is offered, containing in each case the conclusions presented after several hours of lecturing. A summary of the contents of the larger sections will give the reader some idea of what he will find in this work. I. The Preaching of John the Baptist. II. The Teaching of Jesus. III. The Teaching of the Apostles. Chap. 1: The Common Faith of the Apostolic Church. Chap. 2: The Apostolic Preaching and Teaching in Israel. Chap. 3: The Gospel among the Gentiles and the Theology of Paul. Chap. 4: The Eschatological Cycle of Teaching. Chap. 5: Peculiar Forms of Doctrine in the Apostolic Age. The work embraces 132 pages. It naturally is very compact, the views of the author being given in as condensed statements as possible. Everywhere the vast learning of the venerable Doctor and his intimate acquaintance with the New Testament are in evidence. Floods of light are frequently thrown on texts by a short sentence or phrase. Dr. Zahn is a conservative theologian, and hence a believer can read his books without that constant irritation which accompanies the reading of works by negative critics like Harnack or Lake. It is hardly necessary to add that we cannot endorse all the views presented in this work.

Eugippius: Vita Sancti Severini. In Auswahl. Herausgegeben von Alfons Tewes. 80 Pf. (Verlag von G. G. Teubner, Leipzig. 1928.)

Severinus, who labored as pastor and missionary in the territory of the upper Danube, died 482. His activities are described by his pupil, Eugippius, who, in telling about his master's life, furnishes a good picture of conditions in those turbulent times. The Latin is comparatively easy, and the editor has supplied valuable hints in the footnotes.

